



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

be incapable."—Page 125, stage scenery, *telón corto*: the sense of an act with two stage settings, or tableaux, instead of two separate acts, is not clear to the average reader from merely bringing together the component elements furnished by the vocabulary, "short curtain." In the same stage setting we find *ventanal*, which is inserted in the vocabulary on the same terms as *ventana*, "window," of which last it is not synonymous but rather = *una serie de ventanas, una galería de cristales*.—Page 125, l. 4, *la Hermana Contadora*, "prop. noun" (vocab.): it is the convent treasurer or accountant (i. e. *cajera*).—Similarly, p. 137, l. 6, *la Hermana Guardiana* is put in vocab. as "prop. noun," whereas it is the janitress, so to speak, of the convent.

The following are some omissions:—Page 10, l. 19, *dar en*, 'to take the notion or idea.'—Page 11, l. 8, *dió que (hablar)*, '(it) gave cause, or grounds, for.'—Page 14, l. 5, (*para decir*) *cuatro (palabras)*, i. e., 'to have a chance to say something.' In a juxtaposition of this kind in Spanish *cuatro* does not necessarily mean "four," as a definite numeral, but represents characteristically an indefinite idea of restriction as *anglice*, 'a couple.' Examples are not infrequent, although I am not aware of the subject being mentioned in the dictionaries or in the accessible grammars; as: *cuatro terrones*, a few bits of land; *cuatro dones*, some paltry talents; *cuatro palabras (al lector)*, a sort of brief prefatory notice, etc.—Page 45, l. 10, *dejar (á uno) mal*, 'to leave in the lurch, disappoint.'—Page 48, l. 4, *¡Anda con Dios!* a characteristic expression of dazed astonishment, as 'Mercy on us!'—Page 58, l. 24, *tengo para mí*, 'I am of the opinion.'—Page 81, l. 26, *pues no faltaba más*, 'why certainly.'—Page 102, l. 19, *píde por esa boca*, 'ask what you please.'—Page 125, l. 13, *sién*, 'forehead.'

The following typographical errors are noted:—Page 11, l. 5, *llomaremos*; p. 107, l. 3, *acorbardándose*; p. 128, l. 6, *et for en*; p. 133, l. 24, *chiton* for *chitón*; p. 136, l. 1, *hermada* for *hermana*; in vocab. *respirar*, "to breath"; in Act IV the punctuation is faulty at the beginning of sc. iii (p. 101) and in sc. xi (p. 121, l. 12), the latter case occurring also in the Madrid edition.

R. E. BASSETT.

University of Kansas.

GERMAN LITERATURE.

A History of German Literature. By JOHN G. ROBERTSON. New York: Putnam, 1902. xxviii, 365 pp.

There has long been a vacant place waiting for a sober, accurate, and up-to-date English study of the general field of German Literature, based upon the results of modern scholarship without being too technical. Professor Robertson's book fills this vacancy quite acceptably, and immediately takes its place as the most useful work on the subject, as a general hand-book, that has yet appeared in English. This new History of German Literature has not the brilliancy, breadth, and originality of Scherer's masterpiece, nor the kindling enthusiasm and eloquence of Professor Francke's "Social Forces," but partly for that reason, because of its eminent sobriety, it is a safer guide for the beginner; and it differs so widely from both these works that it may well be used together with them.

Professor Robertson's book is essentially a descriptive study, and it has both the advantages and limitations implied in this characterization. It succeeds in giving a very good idea of the literature of the important periods, of the work of the principal authors, and of individual masterpieces; and to this end the many outlines given of the greatest works discussed are most useful and acceptable. At the same time the work as a whole is more like a picture gallery than like a history. Undoubtedly the thing done—the description of the literature—was the first thing to be done; the question is whether more attention might not have been given to general movements, to the great lines of development, to comparative study, both within the single literature and with other literatures, without unduly swelling the size of the volume. One would consent to the omission of a considerable proportion of the names mentioned, for the sake of more emphasis upon the evolution and comparative aspects of the literature studied. The introduction is excellent in this respect, but it gives only a very brief summing up. Especially would a larger reference to parallel or contrasting phenomena in English literature be welcome for its pedagogical value.

Every new history of literature that appears

suggests anew the really chaotic state of the theory of literary history. The embarrassment of the bewildering multiplicity of modern interests is especially troublesome to the literary historian, and it is particularly difficult for him to find a unifying principle for his work. If the study of literature is a branch of æsthetics, that fact hardly appears in our literary histories; and, indeed, an attempt to proceed upon this basis would doubtless be a sad failure. As for an ethical study of literature, that is under a traditional taboo, especially in Germany, and the present work, with its warfare upon *Tendenz*, is an interesting example of German influence in this regard. There remain such other interests as the political and sociological, the philosophic, the philological, and most recently the psychological; and while an occasional literary historian has the courage to give one of these free rein while holding all the rest in check, the usual custom is rather to let several or all of them run along together in rather haphazard fashion. The work before us has this character of multiform interest. But by sacrificing the advantages of a single point of view, the author has doubtless gained in accuracy of detail and has made his work an excellent book of reference. The suggestions that may be made for the possible improvement of the work must also apply largely to details.

The general plan of the book is pretty strictly chronological, with the traditional division into periods. There are some departures from the exact chronological order, however, due to the grouping of authors and to the difficulty of placing definitely a long life, like that of Goethe or of Tieck. In some cases, the order of the names leads to chronological confusion. For example, the reader would get the impression, but for careful attention to the marginal dates, that Zesen belonged to a later generation than Christian Weise and Schnabel; and again, the placing of Uhland and Grillparzer after the chapter on Young Germany will pretty surely give the student a wrong perspective. It is, of course, impossible to reconcile completely the conflicting demands of biographical unity, proper grouping, and historical sequence; but the chronological setting once being adopted, it should be made as

easy as possible for the reader to keep in mind the sequence of men and events.

The general distribution of space to the various larger periods is about what was to be expected: 36 pages to Old High German, a good allowance of over 100 pages to Middle High German, slightly less to the next three centuries and a half up to 1700 (this long period is somewhat stinted), and the larger bulk of the book to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries (180 and 210 pages respectively.) This emphasis of the more modern literature is as it should be. The only matter for regret is that the last thirty years of the century just closed are treated so briefly; inasmuch as there is no good study in English of the interesting developments during this period, it is to be hoped that a longer chapter may be devoted to them in a future edition of this History.¹

Putting aside all that is fairly open to difference of opinion, the following running commentary of criticisms in detail may be offered: pp. 12, 14, the name Isidore is not used consistently.—p. 15. There is not sufficient warrant for calling the Wessobrunn Prayer a "poetic beginning," or poems like it a point of departure for secular poetry.—p. 18f. The ordinary reader will hardly know what the "Tours of the North" may mean, or where Werden is located. To call the 9th century "the brightest in the OHG. period" is to consider only the literature that happens to be preserved, and to neglect all that must have perished.—p. 25. The inferiority of Otfried's diddling meter to the old alliterative form in dignity and power should not be overlooked. It seems strange to call Otfried the "culminating point" of a literature that had long ago produced poems of the quality of the *Hildebrandslied*.—p. 27. Read "such poems as the *Hildebrandslied*," etc. The student should not get the impression that the wreckage that has survived the ages is all that ever existed.—p. 32. In view of earlier Greek examples, *Ruodlieb* cannot be called the first romance of adventure in European literature.—p. 48. The term "saga" seems misapplied to the

¹ Even Professor Coar's interesting *Studies in German Literature in the 19th Century*, which have appeared since the words above were written, give comparatively little space to this generation.

Oriental anecdotal matter of *Salman und Morolf* (cf. also p. 110).—p. 49. It is not made clear why "indigenous forces were not sufficient".—p. 60. Lachmann's ballad theory has certainly been decidedly "weakened" in that its most explicit postulates have been discredited by more recent criticism; about all that is left of his theory is given simply and directly in the poem itself: *uns ist in alten mæren wunders vil geseit . . .*—p. 70. The dramatic structure and quality of the *Nibelungenlied* might be emphasized, as compared with the more epic nature of the saga and of the *Iliad*.—pp. 92, 96. The author minimizes or overlooks the importance of Parzival's sin and conversion; Wolfram, too, saw the "tragedy of doubt and spiritual revolt" in his work.—p. 94. Wolfram's conception of the grail was not so simple and consistent as represented in the note.—p. 96f. Wolfram's large-minded tolerance is worthy of special note.—p. 99, l. 6, read "rationalism" for "naturalism" (cf. also p. 110, l. 19).—p. 105. Where Gottfried's earnestness is mentioned, his extreme artificiality should also be noted, and his lack of the deep sincerity and moral power of Wolfram.—p. 116. The erroneous impression is here given that the idealized and spiritualized conception of *Minne* was the only one held by the German Minnesingers. The external forms of the *Minnesang* might well be described.—p. 126. It would be worth while to insist upon Walther's realism, and the genuineness that is found in his expression of nature together with the conventionality characteristic of the *Minnesang*.—p. 130. The expression *niedere Minne* should perhaps be explained.—p. 184. The *Knittelvers* might be described more exactly.—p. 199. Goethe was not the first to take the modern view of Faust's strivings.—p. 207. The forms used by Opitz, especially the Alexandrine, should be defined.—p. 312. It is strange that the comparatively feeble lines *Mit einen gemalten Band* should be selected to characterize the new epoch in modern poetry opened by Goethe.—p. 321. The characterization of Egmont as a *Stürmer und Dränger* is not particularly apt.—p. 329. Schiller's *Student von Nasau* was a drama, not a romance.—p. 332. Schubart hardly intended his *Kaplied* as a "song in praise of colonization".—p. 350. A yearning for peace of soul is even more characteristic than a

love of nature in the lyrics of this period.—p. 353. To speak of subjectivity as "dross" implies a rather startling condemnation of all lyricism; and Goethe confessed that all his work was essentially subjective!—p. 390. Mary's death may not be morally deserved, but it certainly is not a dramatic accident.—p. 421. It is a great deal to say—in view of Goethe and Platen—that *Der gestiefelte Kater* is the best satirical drama in German literature.—p. 435. Debucourt-LeVeau's *La cruche cassée* can hardly be described as a picture of the Dutch school; it is Kleist who transmutes the French tone of the picture into Dutch.—p. 452. It is confusing to speak of the *Elegie* and the *Trilogie der Leidenschaft*, as the one is included in the other.—p. 510. Heine's prophetic zeal seems overestimated, it is more than doubtful whether he would have been equal to an "opportunity" if it had come.—p. 535. Hero's lamp is extinguished by the priest, not by a storm.—p. 539. It seems extravagant praise to speak of even one of Raimund's characters in the same breath with Molière, and to say that "no writer"—i. e. no other writer—"ever made such an astonishing advance" as Raimund from his prentice work to his best: after all, even his best remains mediocre.—p. 589. The term "epic" is very large for a pretty little romance like Scheffel's *Trompeter*.—pp. 593, 595. It should be stated what "kind" of masterpiece is represented by *Hans Lange* and *Colberg*, and what themes were "of absorbing interest" to Wilbrandt's contemporaries.—p. 598ff. The author follows Koch and others in overestimating the importance of Wagner's works as literature; one may be a passionate admirer of Wagner's operas and do just homage to the genius of the man and his great influence, and yet confess that he lacked very much of being a great poet.

In the language of the History, the tendency toward an unnecessary use of German terms may be mildly criticised, as also the use of "pathos" in the German rather than the English sense (p. 592 and elsewhere), and the loose use of "naïve" (pp. 595, 606, 608, etc.) Only a few misprints were noted, in addition to those corrected in the Errata: p. 344, note, *Schüddedekopf*; p. 347, margin, *Ansichten*; p. 351, l. 13, *über den Wassern*; p. 388, l. 7, comma after *notwithstanding*, not

after *aims* and *public*; p. 495, l. 7 fr. below, *van Beethoven*; p. 525, note, *Mayne*; p. 527, l. 8 fr. below, *Lyrische*; p. 541, note 2, *C. Hepp*; p. 551, note 3, *C. C. T. Litzmann*; p. 624, *Brookes* omitted; p. 629, *Klinger*, 325ff. for 375ff.

The bibliographical notes are very useful and on the whole quite accurate and up to date. The typography of the book is excellent.

JOHN SCHOLTE NOLLEN.

Indiana University.

FRENCH LITERATURE.

La Mère de la Marquise par EDMOND ABOUT, edited with notes and vocabulary by MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH, Ph. D., Instructor in Romance Languages, Johns Hopkins University. Boston: D. C. Heath and Co., 1903.¹

Edmond About was one of the wittiest French writers of the nineteenth century and most of his novels are characterized by a light sarcastic vein. "*La Mère de la Marquise*", a humorous little satire of about one hundred pages, is an excellent illustration of his style. It cannot fail to delight the students for whom it is destined.

Dr. Brush's edition is especially prepared for intermediate classes and is provided with plentiful notes and a vocabulary.

The following mistakes and misprints are called to the attention of the editor.

P. 8, l. 22, p. 11, l. 22, and in the vocabulary, *samavar* should be spelled *samovar*. The Paris edition (1860) has the same misprint.

P. 9, l. 26, *ainé* should be spelled *ainé*;

p. 12, l. 14, *aurait, auraient*;

p. 30, l. 13, *adresse*, which does not mean anything here, should be replaced by *tendresse*. See Paris edition, 1860.

P. 32, l. 8, *partageait* should read *partageait*;

p. 36, l. 15, *vu, vus*;

p. 41, l. 4, *lo, le*;

p. 46, l. 25, *come, comme*, and l. 31, *apartement, appartement*;

p. 49, l. 26, *etait, était*;

p. 67, l. 28, *que, qui*;

p. 78, l. 4, *ses, ces*;

p. 83, l. 26, *de père fils, de père en fils*; same omission of *en* in the vocabulary under the words *père* and *fils*.

P. 86, l. 3, *tout, toute*;

p. 92, l. 8 and in the vocabulary, *résolument* should be spelled *résolument*;

p. 100, l. 9, *toute, tout*, and l. 26, *après, après*;

p. 101, l. 10, *étonné, étonné*;

p. 108, l. 14, *examples, exemples*, and l. 28, *convint, convint*;

p. 109, l. 4, insert a hyphen between *petits* and *enfants*.

P. 112, note on p. 4. 2, *proposition* should read *preposition*;

p. 117, note on p. 33. 5, *coutait, coutait*.

In the vocabulary, p. 129, under the word *beaucoup*, insert a comma after *much* and under the words *bec* and *béâtre*, transpose the period and the dash.

Bergeronette should be written *bergeronnette*.

Add a comma after *bombé*. Under the word *cérémonie, faire de* — should read *faire des* —s. The editor seems to have been misled by the negative form in the text, for which see p. 22, l. 32.

The letter *f* after *clientèle* should be italicized. P. 133, *campagne* should read *compagne*. *Finistère, mensonge* and *opéra* should be marked masculine instead of feminine. *Incessamment* should be written *incessamment*; *inquiéter, inquiéter*; *isolement, m., isolement*.

Under *maudire*, transpose the dash and the comma. *Paru* is given a feminine form *parue* as in the large dictionaries of Bescherelle and Larousse; *paraître* being intransitive and its past participle being always conjugated with *avoir*, the feminine form of the latter can never be used.

Under *pli*, drop the dash after *was*; under *révolter*, drop the comma after *to*; in *rondelet*, insert a dash between the *l* and the ending. *Subite* is the feminine form of the adjective; we should have *subit, -e*.

Under *sortir*, we have the expression: *sortir du bon sens* while the text gives: *sortir de son bon sens*; see p. 8, l. 12. Under *suivant*, we should

¹In a second impression of the text-book, now under way, the editor has been enabled to embody the greater part of Prof. François' valuable suggestions and corrections.—M. P. B.